Exhibit H

WILMERHALE

Amy Kreiger Wigmore

+1 202 663 6096 (t)
+1 202 663 6363 (f)
amy.wigmore@wilmerhale.com

July 26, 2006

Via Facsimile and First-Class Mail
Charanjit Brahma
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Re: *Smith Kline & French Laboratories, LTD and SmithKline Beecham Corp., d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 05-197 (D. Del.)

Dear Charanjit:

I am writing to confirm the agreement we have reached regarding the status of Teva's enablement challenge to the '860 patent. Teva will not pursue the contention that Claim 3 of the '860 patent is invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1 for failure to enable a person of ordinary skill in the art to determine without undue experimentation what constitutes an "effective non-toxic amount" of ropinirole hydrochloride to treat Parkinson's Disease in a human being. In exchange, GSK will not pursue the contention that Teva's invalidity challenge to the '860 patent fails because the prior art cited by Teva's experts does not disclose what would constitute an "effective non-toxic amount" of ropinirole hydrochloride to treat Parkinson's Disease in a human being.

It is also my understanding that Teva is not pursuing its enablement challenges to claims 8-12 of the '808 patent and claims 1 and 2 of the '860 patent, as those claims are not being asserted by GSK in this action pursuant to the Joint Stipulation and Proposed Order entered on June 26, 2006.

Please let me know immediately (and, in any event, no later than close of business on **July 27, 2006**) if you have a different understanding of the agreement set forth above.

Sincerely,

Amy K. Wigmore